MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2014 series

9694 THINKING SKILLS

9694/43 Paper 4 (Applied Reasoning), maximum raw mark 50

1   **Study the table below. For each of the inferences A–E, write down whether it is true or false that the inference can reliably be drawn from the graph.** [5]

A	The number of licensed firearms is inversely proportional to firearm crime	False
B	A decrease in the number of licensed firearms has no effect on the rate of firearm crime	False
C	Some firearm crimes do not involve violence	True
D	Legally held firearms are not responsible for firearm crime	False
E	The government restriction on firearm ownership has failed to reverse the trend in firearm crime	True

1 mark for each correctly-ascribed truth value.

2   **Briefly analyse U-Top's argument in Document 1: *New World Order,* by identifying its main conclusion and main reasons, as well as any intermediate conclusions and counter-arguments.** [6]

IC – (Any thinking person would agree with me that) the UN's permanent member system (, which was adopted 60 years ago,) is out of date.

MR – These five permanent members (can never agree among themselves and) are a detriment to world peace.
IC – These [economically powerful] nations [who bear the brunt of globalisation] should replace the Security Council and be given non-permanent rotational memberships in a world government council.

IC – (Thus) we would be able to create a sustainable, peaceful and secure world.

CA – (They say that) any world government could become tyrannical and taken over by a few who would exploit the rest of the people of Earth for their own greed and profit.

IC – (So,) we have to create new institutions with enforcement powers way beyond the current mandate of the UN.

MC – All people around the globe should rally to the call to set up a new world government on Earth capable of bringing in world peace.
IC – (These basic rights are necessary for our survival, and) we should demand them [these basic human rights] from those who want to govern us.

Marks
1 mark for each element (maximum 4 if MC not credited).

3   **Give a critical evaluation of the strength of U-Top's argument in Document 1: *New World Order,* by identifying and explaining any flaws, implicit assumptions and other weaknesses.** **[9]**

Paragraph 1

"any thinking person" is an attempt to close the debate by suggesting that any other points of view are merely unthinking.

"On what grounds…" is a piece of rhetoric that attempts to persuade the reader that there are no grounds for thinking that the status quo of 60 years ago could still be relevant.

Paragraph 2

Assumption that the members of the Security Council will not give up their privileges.

Inconsistency – The author ultimately argues that the UN must be disbanded but acknowledges that a simple reform ("they give up their privileges") might be an adequate alternative.

Restricting the options – There may be other ways to resolve the matter than either giving up privileges or abolishing the UN altogether.

Assumption that the permanent members of the Security Council are not economically powerful member nations / that economically powerful nations are not the real powers today.

Assumption that the new group of nations ("the real world powers") would not also exhibit disunity.

The proposition for a new world government council is confused and inconsistent: it seems to give the assurance of decision-making by majority while at the same time giving a privileged status to the set of "economically powerful nations".

Paragraph 3

Assumption that the new governing council would be more competent than the current one.

Slippery slope / overdrawn IC – It has not been adequately demonstrated that the author's proposal would lead to the extreme scenario of a "sustainable, peaceful and secure world".

Assumption that the new governing council would be more effective at enforcing international law.
Assumption that the enforcement of international law is positively correlated with justice in the world.

Paragraph 4

Straw man – The author misrepresents the views of those opposed to change; there are many other valid reasons why people are negatively disposed to world government.

ad hominem – attacking those who criticise, rather than their arguments, as scaremongers and pessimists.

Paragraph 5

Contradictions / Inconsistencies – After ridiculing the objection that a world government would be tyrannical the model proposed here appears to be exactly that – heavy-handed and oppressive with absolute power concentrated in the hands of a powerful few.

Inconsistency – Having stated previously that their proposal for a new world government would "create a sustainable, peaceful and secure world", the author now seems to be concerned with the challenges of mere survival under this new system.

There is possibly conflict within the idea that the proposed institution would eliminate "all privileges that benefit only a few states" (paragraph 3), and yet would be "resourced by the economic giants".

Paragraph 6

The author is under-representing the desires of people as being simply those things which are necessary for survival.

General

The passage contains several examples of rhetorical or loaded language used in place of valid reasoning, e.g. "uncaringly hog", "any thinking person" etc.

Marks
Award 1 mark for each correct point and 2 marks for a point that is well-expressed.
(Maximum 9 marks.)

4 **'The UN should be abolished.'**

To what extent do you agree with this statement? Construct a well-reasoned argument in support of your view, commenting critically on some or all of Documents 1 to 5, and introducing ideas of your own. [30]

Level	Structure	Max 8	Quality of argument	Max 8	Use of documents	Max 8	Treatment of counter positions	Max 6
4	Precise conclusion and accomplished argument structure with consistent use of intermediate conclusions. Likely to include at least two of the following: • strands of reasoning • suppositional reasoning • analogy • evidence • examples Argument is structured so the thought process is made clear. Uses vocabulary of reasoning appropriately and effectively to support argument.	7–8	Cogent and convincing reasoning which answers the question which was asked. Subtle thinking about the issue. Use of relevant own ideas and ideas from documents. Very few significant gaps or flaws.	7–8	Perceptive, relevant and accurate use of documents to support reasoning. Sustained and confident evaluation of documents to support reasoning. (More than 2 evaluative references to documents or nuanced evaluation). Able to combine information from two or more documents and draw a precise inference.	7–8	Anticipation of key counter arguments not mentioned in documents and effective response to these. Use of valid critical tools to respond to counter arguments. Frequent effective use of appropriate terminology.	5–6
3	Clear conclusion that is more than "I agree". Clear argument structure, which may be simple and precise or attempt complexity with some success. Appropriate use of intermediate conclusions. Use of other argument elements to support reasoning. Generally makes thinking clear. Appropriate use of vocabulary of reasoning.	5–6	Effective and persuasive reasoning which answers the question which was asked. (Although there may be some irrelevance or reliance on dubious assumptions.) Use of own ideas and ideas from documents. Few significant gaps or flaws.	5–6	Relevant and accurate use of documents which supports reasoning. (Likely to reference at least 3 documents.) Some evaluation of documents to support reasoning. Inference drawn from ≥ 1 document.	5–6	Consideration of relevant counter arguments and effective response to these. Attempt to use critical tools to respond to counter arguments. Some use of appropriate terminology.	3–4

Level	Structure	Max 8	Quality of argument	Max 8	Use of documents	Max 8	Treatment of counter positions	Max 6
2	Clear, straightforward argument or a discourse at length with a focus on the ideas and content but only a basic structure. Conclusion stated or clearly implied. Conclusion may be "I agree". Uses reasons. Sufficient clarity for meaning to be clear. Some appropriate use of vocabulary of reasoning.	3–4	A reasoned stance which answers the general thrust of the question which was asked. Some support for the conclusion. (Although there may be considerable irrelevance or reliance on dubious assumptions.) Some thinking/own ideas about the issue. Use of rhetorical questions and emotive language. Some significant gaps or flaws.	3–4	Some relevant and accurate use of documents, but some documents used indiscriminately. Some (perhaps implicit) comparison of documents or some critical evaluation of or inferences drawn from, documents.	3–4	Inclusion of counter argument or counter assertion but response to this is ineffective.	2
1	Attempt to construct and argument. Unclear or no conclusion. Disjointed, incoherent reasoning. Use of examples in place of reasoning. Possibly a discourse or a rant. Reasons presented with no logical connection. Substantial irrelevant material.	1–2	Attempt to answer the general thrust of the question. Attempt to support their view. Excessive use of rhetorical questions and emotive language. Ideas which are contradictory.	1–2	Some, perhaps implicit, use of documents. No attempt at critical evaluation. No comparison of documents.	1–2	Inclusion of counter argument or counter assertion with no response.	1
0	No creditworthy material	0	No creditworthy material	0	No creditworthy material	0	No creditworthy material	0

Example Level 4 Answer *(725 words)*

The UN was put in place after World War 2 as a means of, ideally, preventing further conflict in the future. The big concern after WW2 was the enormous global threat posed by nuclear weapons. Insofar as this feared conflict has not materialised, it seems reasonable to argue that the UN has done its job well. For this, and other reasons, the UN should not be abolished.

It could, of course, be argued that we do not know what would have happened in the absence of the UN but, prior to its existence, wars between powerful nations were common – WW2, WW1, the Napoleonic wars, to name 3 – now they are less so. Document 5 illustrates that wars that are ongoing and could be used as evidence that the UN is not doing its job. However, Wikipedia is a source severely lacking in credibility, as expertise is not a criterion for authorship and authors post information anonymously at no risk to any reputations they might have. Furthermore, the data tell us nothing about the number of deaths during conflict prior the UN's existence and we cannot know the number of wars that would currently be on-going if the UN did not exist. Equally, the pro-UN Document 2 asks the rhetorical question, "Would international hostilities subside [without the UN]?". Uri Manatz believes not, so the fact that there is conflict in the world today cannot be used to claim that the UN is not doing its job.

Petty nationalistic squabbles lead to war, suffering and death. The blog comments in Document 3 lack credibility but illustrate the problem – the Indian contributor thinks India should be on the Security Council, the Pakistani contributor does not. The UN provides a talking shop where representatives from countries can put their point of view across and listen to the views of others. Knowledge of others promotes understanding, which promotes tolerance. The UN is not perfect by any means, but it is doing a reasonable job at keeping the peace.

Stephen Hawking's question, described in Document 4, suggests that there are some major problems facing the world over the next 100 years. Stephen is an intelligent chap and, on the face of it, unbiased. If these problems do exist then it is more likely that solutions will be found if countries work together. Working together needs some co-ordination so a global body that is above national interest is essential, and one already exists in the form of the UN.

Document 2, which seems much more balanced than Document 1, lists some key achievements of the UN to-date, in addition to its peacekeeping role: the spread of democracy and human rights across the world is a global achievement and could be said to be the solution to a global problem. To these we could add the cultural and humanitarian projects funded by the UN. If they have solved global problems in the past they seem the very people to solve them in the future – the most reliable predictor of future performance is past performance.

As an aid to peace and understanding the UN has had some success. If the global problems of the future need to be tackled on a global scale, a global institution is needed to do it. The author of Document 1 is clearly anti-UN. However, he suggests replacing the UN with something that sounds very like the UN. Not only does this inherent contradiction severely undermine U-top's argument, it supports the retention of the UN, as the alternative he proposes seems frighteningly totalitarian. The UN might not be perfect but it is there. Abolishing any organisation and building a replacement costs a lot of money in redundancy, legal fees, construction etc. Unless there is a strong case for abolition therefore, reform of a current institution is likely to be a less expensive way of moving forward and a strong case for abolition has not been made at all.

Complete peace and prosperity are unachievable but it would be a fallacy of unobtainable perfection not to try – parents do not stop cleaning their house just because children leave muddy footprints on the carpet.

The UN has been doing a good job and it seems better than either abandoning it altogether or replacing it with an institution such as the one suggested in Document 1. It should, therefore, not be abolished.